inhibitors produced by microorganisms and homologues of host derived immune system inhibitors that are produced by microorganisms, said homologues selected from the group consisting of homologues of interleukin-10, homologues of soluble receptors for interleukin-1, homologues of soluble receptors for interferon α, homologues of soluble receptors for interferon β, homologues of soluble receptors for interferon γ, and homologues of soluble receptors for tumor necrosis factors α and β].

10 ~~12~~. (Twice Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein said binding partner is a binding partner to which the targeted immune system inhibitor [naturally] binds in nature.

12 ~~14~~. (Twice Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein said binding partner is a fragment of a binding partner to which the targeted immune system inhibitor [naturally] binds in nature, wherein said fragment specifically binds to said targeted immune system inhibitor.

41. (Reiterated) The method of claim 1, wherein the binding partner bound to the targeted immune system inhibitor is removed by chemical or biological means.

REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended to Dr. Mark Howell, Dr. Cheryl Selinsky, Dr. Angela Dallas-Pedretti, and Mr. Gary Connell during the telephone interview on February 6, 2001. During this interview, the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 was discussed. Specifically, the cited references of Lentz and Selinsky et al. were discussed, particularly with reference to the advantages of separating the cellular and acellular fractions of whole blood that are not applicable to the method of Lentz, and Applicants' position that Selinsky et al. represents no more than an invitation to experimentation. The Examiner suggested that one or more of the inventors should submit a Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 to reiterate these points against the obviousness rejection, and that such a Declaration may be sufficient to overcome this rejection. In addition, the Examiner indicated that if the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is overcome, the species election will be reconsidered and most likely will be withdrawn.

Objections to the Claims:

(a) The Examiner has objected to Claims 10 and 11 as including species drawn to non-elected inventions. Since the Examiner has indicated in the telephone interview of February 6 that the

41